



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,396	08/28/2001	Hiroaki Yamoto	ADTST.031AUS	6154
7590	08/11/2005		EXAMINER	
MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES Suite 225 7700 Irvine Center Drive Irvine, CA 92618			SIEK, VUTHE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	
			DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/941,396	YAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vuthe Siek	2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application 09/941,396 and amendment filed on 4/22/2005. Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,645. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent claims claiming substantially similar limitations as recited in application claims, except for modifying and feedback steps. In order to verify the silicon prototype as required, it would have been obvious to

practitioners in the art to modify the event based test vectors in order obtain desired response outputs from the silicon prototype and then feedback the modified event based test vectors in order to modify and correct the IC design data in order to comply with an intended IC design as desired and required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Komoto (5,740,086).

6. As to claims 1, 9, 10 and 19, Komoto teaches substantially similar claimed limitations of validating design of complex IC (Fig. 1-5 and its description) comprising building prototype silicon based on IC design data produced under the EDA environment (testing actual produced semiconductor devices by using test bench written by a hardware description language and test vector in an event drive format obtained through the design stage of semiconductor devices by the CAD system (see summary); linking EDA tools including a simulator with an event based test system (test system) (summary, col. 4-6); extracting event format data from a value change dump file (test vector file, event memory, waveform data memory) resulted from executing a testbench produced in the IC design data by the simulator (see summary, col. 4-6);

installing the extracted event data (see summary, col. 4-6); applying event based test vectors derived from the IC design data to the prototype silicon by an event based test system and evaluating the response output of the prototype silicon, where the event based test vectors are test vectors in an event format in which an event is any change in a signal which is described by its timing and the event based test system is a test system for testing an IC by utilizing the event based test vectors (see summary, col. 4-6); modifying the event based test vectors by the event based test system to acquire desired response outputs from the silicon prototype; and feedbacking the modified event based test vectors to the EDA environment to modify the IC design data, thereby correcting the design errors in the IC design data (see summary, col. 4-6).

7. As to claims 2-8 and 11-18, Komoto teaches linking EDA tools including a simulator with the event based test system through software (Fig. 1-4); extracting event format data (summary; col. 4-6); installing the extracted event data and generating event based test vectors to apply the test vectors to the prototype silicon (DUT); creating a new test bench based the modified event based test vectors (col. 4-6); viewing and editing waveforms (Fig. 1-5, col. 4-6); change clock rates and event timing data (col. 4-6).

8. Remarks: the current claims are not patentable over Komoto's patent.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vuthe Siek whose telephone number is (571) 272-1906. The examiner can normally be reached on Increase Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vuthe Siek



VUTHE SIEK
PRIMARY EXAMINER